

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action of June 7, 2005, and the Advisory Action of September 26, 2005, have been carefully reviewed and this response addresses the concerns stated in the Office Action and Advisory Action. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-18, 21, 22, and 24-43 are pending in the application. Claims 19, 20, and 23 have been previously cancelled. Claims 21, 22, and 24-43 have been allowed. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 have been rejected. Dependent claims 6 and 16-18 have been objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims, but would be allowable if dependent claims 6 and 16 were rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102(e)

On pages 2-3, in paragraphs 1-2, claims 1, 2, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Treyz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,587,835, issued July 1, 2003 (Treyz).

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

On pages 5-7, paragraphs 3-4, claims 3-5, 8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz in view of Aufricht et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0052781, published on May 2, 2002 (Aufricht).

IV. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 to place them in condition for allowance by combining them with objected to dependent claims 6 and 16, respectively, along with the intervening claims of dependent claim 6 (dependent claims 2 and 5) and dependent claim 16 (dependent claim 15). Dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 15, and 16 have been canceled without prejudice.

Dependent claims 3 and 4 have been amended to now depend from amended independent claim 1 (now believed to be in condition of allowance) instead of canceled dependent claim 2, and are therefore in condition for allowance as well.

Appl. No. 09/929,979
Amdt. Dated, October 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2005 and Advisory Action of September 26, 2005
Docket No.: 12078-141

Dependent claim 17 has been amended to depend from amended independent claim 9 (now believed to be in condition of allowance) instead of canceled dependent claim 16, and is therefore in condition for allowance as well.

Dependent claims 7 and 8 depend from amended independent claim 1 (now believed to be in condition of allowance), and are therefore in condition for allowance as well.

Dependent claims 10-14 and 18 depend from amended independent claim 9 (now believed to be in condition of allowance), and are also in condition for allowance.

V. CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-14, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 24-43 are now in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, 19, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to file a Continuation Application on the broader subject matter of the invention not allowed in this application.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the all rejections and objections, and find claims 1, 3, 4, 7-14, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 24-43 allowable from the reasons stated above, and further respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants have herein requested a one-month extension of time and therefore enclose a check for \$120 (large entity). Although it is believed that no other fees are due, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-2410, Order No. 12078-141.

The following information is presented in the event that a call may be deemed desirable by the Examiner: Peter J. Borghetti (617) 854-4000

Respectfully submitted,
Noah J. Ternullo et al., Applicants

By:



Peter J. Borghetti
Reg. No. 42,345
Attorney for Applicants

Date: October 7, 2005